was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the present invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The outstanding Official Action contends on page 3 that the method of the present invention would only give rise to a polyclonal antiserum. The Official Action contends that the production of monoclonal antibodies requires several additional screening and isolation steps.

However, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate and know how to produce a monoclonal antibody from the polyclonal antiserum of the present invention.

While it is true that the polyclonal antiserum of the present invention would give rise to a mixture of antibodies in which some would bind flk-1, some would bind flt, and some antibodies would bind both, it is respectfully submitted that the polyclonal antiserum would contain a sufficient proportion of antibodies binding flk but not flt. Once the polyclonal antiserum of the present invention is obtained, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to obtain the desired monoclonal antibody.

It is respectfully noted that claims 25-30 and 32-35 are directed to an anti-idiotypic vascular endothelial growth factor antibody. While the polyclonal antiserum described in the present specification was not reduced to homogeneity at that

time, the polyclonal anti-serum certainly meets and is enabled by the present specification for claims 25-30 and 32-35 which do not require that the antibody having the recited binding specificity be isolated to homogeneity. The production of an antibody being a ligand of the human KOR receptor of the murine flk-1 receptor and not a ligand of flt is fully satisfied. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to produce and isolate the target monoclonal antibody, using the B-lymphocytes corresponding to the polyclonal antiserum.

The attached Rule 132 declaration of the first-named inventor, Dr. Jean PLOUET, addresses this rejection in considerable detail. Furthermore, Rule 132 declarations from Dr. Pierre-Andre CAZENAVE and Pierre FONS are enclosed. The declarations support that one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to obtain a monoclonal antibody from the polyclonal antiserum of the present invention.

As can be seen from the attached declaration of Dr. Jean PLOUET, Dr. PLOUET confirms that it is only a matter of time and routine experimentation to produce monoclonal antibodies from candidate B-lymphocytes and to identify those having the claimed binding specificity of the present invention. In fact, the successful production of monoclonal antibodies has been achieved subsequent to the filing of the International application.

As can be seen from the attached declaration of Dr. Pierre FONS, Dr. Pierre FONS confirms that it is only a matter of

routine experimentation to produce monoclonal antibodies from a range of candidate B-lymphocytes and to identify those antibodies having the claimed binding specificity of the present invention. Pierre FONS was a student in 1997 in the laboratory of Dr. Jean PLOUET. Pierre FONS confirms that monoclonal antibodies of the present invention were obtained over a time period of six months, and that six months is a typical amount of time necessary to perform such an immunization.

The attached Rule 132 declaration of Dr. Pierre-Andre CAZENAVE, also addresses this rejection in detail. As a professor from the Pasteur Institute in Paris and one of the foremost experts in anti-idiotype science, it is respectfully submitted that Dr. CAZENAVE is in a good position to speak with authority on what the present specification actually teaches. The declaration of Dr. CAZENAVE further confirms that one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to obtain the monoclonal antibodies of the present invention from a polyclonal antiserum as a matter of routine experimentation.

Claim 30 was also rejected for allegedly containing a written description of the claimed invention which did not reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to page 8 of the present specification. At page 8, the specification clearly provides support for an "animal".

It is noted that the present specification states that "purified VEGF is injected into an animal, in particular a rabbit". However, it is noted that the French priority application states on page 7 that "on injecte du VEGF purifié chez un animal, notamment un lapin,". The Examiner's attention is specifically directed to the term "notamment". It is respectfully submitted that the correct translation of "notamment" to English would be "for example", or "notably". Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the specification provides support for animals beyond rabbits. Enclosed is a declaration in support of this translation.

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing Remarks, therefore, it is believed that this application has been placed in condition for allowance, with claims 18-35, as amended. Allowance and passage to issue on that basis are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

By Philip A. DuBois

Philip A. DuBois
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 50,696
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 521-2297

March 25, 2002